



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 09/932,433 | 08/18/2001 | Murali Chaparala | ONX-115A/DIV | 3797 |

27652 7590 03/31/2003

JOSHUA D. ISENBERG
204 CASTRO LANE
FREMONT, CA 94539

[REDACTED] EXAMINER

GEMMELL, ELIZABETH M

| ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
|----------|--------------|
| 2882 | |

DATE MAILED: 03/31/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| | | | |
|--|------------------------|---|--|
| Office Action Summary | Application No. | Applicant(s) | |
| | 09/932,433 | CHAPARALA ET AL. | |
| Period for Reply | Examiner | Art Unit | |
| | Beth Gemmell | 2882 | |
| -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address -- | | | |
| <p>A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). - Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). | | | |
| Status | | | |
| <p>1)<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>09 August 2002</u>.</p> <p>2a)<input type="checkbox"/> This action is FINAL. 2b)<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> This action is non-final.</p> <p>3)<input type="checkbox"/> Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i>, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.</p> | | | |
| Disposition of Claims | | | |
| <p>4)<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Claim(s) <u>26-37</u> is/are pending in the application.</p> <p>4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.</p> <p>5)<input type="checkbox"/> Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.</p> <p>6)<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Claim(s) <u>26-37</u> is/are rejected.</p> <p>7)<input type="checkbox"/> Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.</p> <p>8)<input type="checkbox"/> Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.</p> | | | |
| Application Papers | | | |
| <p>9)<input type="checkbox"/> The specification is objected to by the Examiner.</p> <p>10)<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The drawing(s) filed on <u>18 August 2001</u> is/are: a)<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> accepted or b)<input type="checkbox"/> objected to by the Examiner.</p> <p>Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).</p> | | | |
| <p>11)<input type="checkbox"/> The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a)<input type="checkbox"/> approved b)<input type="checkbox"/> disapproved by the Examiner.</p> <p>If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.</p> | | | |
| <p>12)<input type="checkbox"/> The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.</p> | | | |
| Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120 | | | |
| <p>13)<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).</p> <p>a)<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> All b)<input type="checkbox"/> Some * c)<input type="checkbox"/> None of:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1.<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2.<input type="checkbox"/> Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____. 3.<input type="checkbox"/> Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). <p>* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.</p> | | | |
| <p>14)<input type="checkbox"/> Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).</p> <p>a)<input type="checkbox"/> The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.</p> | | | |
| <p>15)<input type="checkbox"/> Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.</p> | | | |
| Attachment(s) | | | |
| <p>1)<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)</p> <p>2)<input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)</p> <p>3)<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) <u>3,8 & 11</u>.</p> | | <p>4)<input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____.</p> <p>5)<input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)</p> <p>6)<input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____.</p> | |

DETAILED ACTION

Receipt is acknowledged of the amendment filed 9 August 2002.

The indicated allowability of claims 32-37 from previous Office Action (paper number 7) is withdrawn in view of recognition that Wood et al. (US Patent 6,396,975) teaches the subject matter of claims 32-37. Any inconvenience is regretted. Rejections based on the newly cited reference follow.

Double Patenting

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 26,27,32-34,36 and 37 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-5,13,14 and 26 of copending Application No. 09/834,744. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other

because all the elements are contained in the co-pending application in an alternative language.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

(f) he did not himself invent the subject matter sought to be patented.

Claims 26-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Wood et al.

Re claim 26: Wood et al. discloses a method for operating a MEMS device having a flap that is movable with respect to a base, the method comprising: applying a pre-bias force to the flap to move the flap at least partially out of contact with an underlying base (column 8, lines 45+).

Re claim 27, 28 and 30: Wood et al. discloses a force which produces a biasing torque on the flap (column 2, lines 35+).

Since the systems in claims 27, 28 and 30 are identical, the forces are the identical, therefore it is inherent that the force reduces stiction, improves reliability and increases switch reliability, therefore no patentable weight is given to these limitations.

Re claim 29: Wood et al. discloses, in figure 4b and throughout the disclosure, the force is applied by a biasing element including a magnetic material (40).

Re claim 31: Wood et al. discloses the biasing torque counteracting another torque exerted on the flap (column 8, lines 50+).

Re claim 32: Wood et al. discloses, in figure 4b and throughout the disclosure, a microelectromechanical apparatus comprising: a base (12), a flap (14) having a portion coupled to the base so that the flap is movable out of the plane of the base from a first angular orientation to a second angular orientation, wherein the base has an opening that receives the flap when the flap is in the second angular orientation (30), the opening having one or more sidewalls, wherein at least one of the sidewalls contacts a portion of the flap such that the flap assumes an orientation substantially parallel to that of the sidewall when the flap is in the second angular orientation, a sidewall electrode disposed in one or more of the sidewalls (34, column 5, lines 12+), and a means for applying a pre-bias force to the flap to move the flap at least partially out of contact with an underlying base (40).

Re claim 33: Wood et al. discloses the means for applying a force applies a fixed force to the flap (column 9, lines 11+).

Re claim 34: Wood et al. discloses the means for applying a forced is a current carrying coil (column 2, lines 47).

Re claim 35: Wood et al. discloses the means for applying a force produces a biasing torque on the flap (column 2, lines 35+).

Re claim 36: Wood et al. discloses the biasing torque counteracting another torque exerted on the flap (column 8, lines 50+).

Claims 26,27,32-34,36 and 37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(f) because the applicant did not invent the claimed subject matter. In light of the evidence available to the examiner, which is currently pending application 09/834,744, having the following inventors Behrang Behin, Michael Daneman, Chuang-Chia Lin, Boris Kobrin, Murali Chaparala, and Gary Zalewski, the examiner is unable to ascertain if the present subject matter was indeed invented as presented in the instant claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim 37 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wood et al.

Wood et al. discloses the use of silicon for the substrate (column 6, lines 8+), however it fails to disclose the use of a silicon-on-insulator wafer.

One of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have recognized the art wide use of a SOI wafer in a MEMS device and it would have been obvious to use a SOI wafer because it improves the reliability of the switch while reducing the cost of manufacture.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 26-31 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Beth Gemmell whose telephone number is (703) 305-1937. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday 6:30-5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Robert Kim can be reached on (703) 305-3492. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 308-7722 for regular communications and (703) 308-7722 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0956.

Art Unit: 2882

emg

February 11, 2003

EMG
SUPERVISOR OF EXAMINER
TECHNICAL DIVISION 2000